

1964

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WAYNE L. HAYS  
AT THE DEDICATION OF THE AMERICAN EM-  
BASSY, DUBLIN

It is my pleasure to be here today to dedicate America's new home in Ireland. The committee of which I am chairman was concerned that we might construct a building that went straight up, of stainless steel and flush glass, appropriate to New York City, perhaps, but not Dublin. No, the inspiration for this building comes from Ireland, herself.

The American architect, John MacLeod Johansen, who designed this Embassy, did as the Irish poets have done.

Recall the lines of Yeats: "Irish poets learn your trade / Sing whatever is well made." This building uniquely recalls the noble Celtic-Christian towers of ancient Ireland built by the Irish people to be places of strength for the preservation of the valued articles of Christian worship.

This reminds me of something that I hear over and over from Speaker McCORMACK, and that is that there should never be any differences between the Scotch, the Irish, and the Welsh, because we are all Celts. I have heard him say this many times to former Speaker Sam Rayburn, who was of Scottish stock and was Speaker longer than anyone, all the while Speaker McCORMACK was his right-hand man and floor leader.

Our Embassy building has been inspired by the Irish past, but it reflects also the ever youthful spirit of Irish mind and heart.

Graceful tradition and youthful vitality come together in this circular design which seems to harmonize the past and present.

Ireland has preserved the past, but is not bound to it. This is a vigorous country. In the years since independence, Ireland has undergone a new and peaceful revolution, an economic and industrial revolution. Economically, we hope and believe that Ireland is in the opening years of a new era that will bring her undreamed of opportunities. Exports to the United States have been multiplying and will continue to increase under your economic expansion program. Irish agriculture is being continually modernized, "secondary industries" based upon food processing are growing rapidly, and the Irish landscape and Ireland's ancient shrines and castles are the center of a fast growing tourist industry.

The increasing standard of living, the speeding up of your pace development, and the greater freedom of trade that will follow the fulfillment of your economic program will, in turn, offer increased opportunities for American trade with Ireland.

Ireland's greatest export product, as we in America well know, is her people. We owe much to the Irish. Need I recall the pages of American history on which Irish names hold a proud place. They are part of the fabric of American history. Indeed, Irish volunteers played so predominant a role in the American Revolutionary Army that Lord Mountjoy commented in the British Parliament, "We have lost America through the Irish." This fighting spirit helped America with its independence, but to secure that independence other qualities of character were needed—Independence of mind, love of freedom and a democratic spirit. These too belong to the Irish.

No less renowned are Ireland's cultural achievements. This Isle of saints and scholars had in the sixth century created a system of education that was superior to anything Europe knew or was to know for many generations. Ireland alone today among Western nations preserves the recorded tradition of native history, the continuity of mind and speech and song, that connect half of Europe with her ancestral past. Ireland knows her own past from the very dawn of civilization through the glory of a medieval age down to the present day.

Her unexcelled tradition of scholarship is significantly evident in her ties with the United States. In June of last year, for example, there was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, the American-Irish Foundation, which has as its principal objective the promotion of cultural and educational relations between the two countries. One of its aims will be to sponsor the interchange of students, teachers, lecturers, professors, musicians, and writers. Although independently organized, the Foundation has the strong support of both the Irish and American Governments. The late President Kennedy and President de Valera agreed to become its patrons. President Johnson has taken a personal interest in this project, agreeing, too, to be its patron, and is deeply appreciative of the role which the Foundation can play in strengthening the cultural and educational ties between our two countries. Indeed only last week at the White House I mentioned to President Johnson that I would be in Ireland today for this dedication and he asked that I convey to you his deep and abiding friendship for Ireland and the Irish and to tell you he hopes one day to follow in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor and to visit Ireland himself.

The Irish Scholarship Board, the official Irish-American organization which sponsors a binational program for exchanging students and lecturers has been granting scholarships for this purpose since 1954. This year, about 25 Irish and American scholars will take part in the program.

There are also about 700 Irish students presently studying in the United States on scholarships, and an increasing number of grants and scholarships is being given to Irish students and institutions through the Ford Foundation, the Kellogg Foundation, and the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. Ireland's own universities have also been a world center for training tomorrow's leaders. Some 1,500 students from Africa and Asia have studied here, and an increasing number of them will, in future years, pore over the books and materials in Ireland's libraries and universities and study the dynamic growth of Ireland, herself.

Ireland is bringing education to others too. In Nigeria alone, Irish missionaries are responsible for thousands of elementary schools, 60 secondary school and 80 teacher training colleges. Plans are being made to extend such educational institutions into other developing areas as well.

The qualities of Irish mind and character that have preserved this scholarship and advanced the frontiers of knowledge have also made Ireland an influential member of the United Nations and a maker and shaper of world peace.

It is with great pride then that I dedicate this, America's home in Ireland—recognized as not only one of the outstanding buildings in Dublin, but in all of Europe.

This joy I feel being here today is, however, mixed with sorrow in the thought that less than a year ago, while the construction of this building was busily going on, President Kennedy, on his memorable stay in Ireland, came to visit this site. You knew him first hand then, his wit, his humor, his courage and strong purpose. You knew these to be genuine.

He was one of you, and he brought honor on the race from which he sprang. Your pride in him equaled our own. No less was his pride in Ireland. Recall some of the words he spoke to the Dail last June:

"Ireland has already set an example and a standard for other small nations to follow," he said. "This has never been a rich or powerful country, and, yet, since the earliest times, its influence on the world has

been rich and powerful. No larger nation did more to keep Christianity and Western cultures alive in their darkest centuries. No larger nation did more to spark the cause of independence in America; indeed, around the world. And no larger nation has ever provided the world with more literary and artistic genius."

He told you, "The major forum for your nation's greater role in world affairs is that of protector of the weak and voice of the small, the United Nations. From Cork to the Congo, from Galway to the Gaza Strip, from this legislative assembly to the United Nations, Ireland is sending its most talented men to do the world's most important work—the work of peace."

John Kennedy was one of those talented men—a son of Ireland. He helped to make the world a better place for men of all races to live out their lives. To us it remains to complete his tragically unfinished ambitions for humanity. It is the struggle for which he fought and finally gave his life. Let us then, here today, dedicate ourselves to continue the tasks he set for himself and for all mankind. As the round towers of old, let this Embassy be a place of strength for the valued articles of faith between us, a faith in a better world, achieved through peace and freedom.

As I said earlier America owes much to the Irish. Perhaps our greatest inheritance from Ireland could be summed up in one sentence from George Bernard Shaw when he said, "Other peoples see things and say: 'Why?'—but I dream things that never were and I say: 'Why not?'"

BRENE M. KERR

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that Mr. Brene M. Kerr, 35, son of the late Senator Robert Kerr, has been named as Deputy Assistant Administrator of NASA for technology utilization. Mr. Kerr is the former manager of land development for Kerr-McGee Industries, Inc., and he was graduated from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1951 with a bachelors degree in geology. In his new post he will be directly below Dr. George Simpson, Assistant Administrator of NASA for Technology Utilization. He is two steps under NASA Administrator Webb, a former official of Kerr-McGee Industries and a former administrative assistant to Senator Kerr. Mr. Kerr will receive \$19,000 a year in his new job.

This is an interesting assignment for this young man, but it will require some serious thinking on his part if he is to avoid actions that may tend to confuse the Kerr financial interests with the interests of the Government. We can hope that he will be careful to avoid any actions that might present problems of conflicts of interest, for it is easy to see how such problems might arise. This is particularly true in the light of the Bobby Baker investigation that indicates that the financial future of Bobby Baker and some of his associates are so closely tied to the future of certain firms in the aerospace and defense industries.

Here are some of the facts that should be kept in mind by the public and the Congress:

First. The Kerr financial institution, Fidelity National Bank & Trust Co., of Oklahoma City, has a large financial stake in the financial future of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker and his friends—Fred B. Black, Jr., lobbyist and convicted tax evader, and two gambling figures, Edward Levinson and Benjamin Sigelbaum. Remember that Black has testified that it was through the Kerr-controlled Fidelity National that he, Baker, Levinson and Sigelbaum borrowed \$100,000 to launch the Serv-U Vending Corp.

It was also the Fidelity National Bank that loaned \$175,000 to Baker and Black for purchase of the stock in the Farmers & Merchants State Bank in Tulsa, Okla. The loans were made on the personal recommendations of the late Senator Robert Kerr.

Second. The financial future of Bobby Baker is tied to Serv-U Vending Corp. Records indicate that Baker and Black owned 57 percent of the stock of this multimillion-dollar corporation. It is a firm that boomed suddenly on the basis of decisions by aerospace industry officials that switched business from older established firms to the new Baker-Black brainchild.

Third. The future of Serv-U is tied to its highly lucrative contracts with various aerospace and defense industries, including North American Aviation and Northrop Aviation. The North American food vending contract alone grosses more than \$2,500,000, according to the testimony.

If these aerospace firms would abandon Serv-U as quickly as they decided to use its services, it could result in a near collapse of the value of Serv-U.

Fourth. The future of North American Aviation and other aerospace industries is tied to the decisions of the multibillion-dollar National Aeronautical and Space Agency—NASA.

The whole arrangement makes an interesting little round robin of dependency with the potential for many favors and many conflicts of interest. We can hope that there would be every effort made to avoid all of the possible pitfalls.

North American has reported that it has ended its contract with Fred Black. It was a contract that was paying him \$180,000 a year for some of his special "consultant" operations in Washington. Apparently Fred Black was too hot for North American.

It is appropriate to ask why North American continues to do business with Bobby Baker's Serv-U? It would be interesting to speculate as to whether Baker, who has taken the fifth amendment, would remain so silent if Government decisions or aerospace industry decisions jeopardized his little gold mine—Serv-U.

#### BREENE M. KERR

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what has prompted my good friend,

the gentleman from Iowa, to make these charges with reference to one of the sons of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr. Breene Kerr is a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I think he graduated very near the head of his class. For several years he has occupied a responsible position in a major oil company in the State of Oklahoma. He certainly has no need financially for a Government job.

He is one of the most gifted young men in Oklahoma. He is modest. He is intelligent. He has had broad experience both in scientific work and in administration.

I personally believe it was a credit to the space agency that the Administrator of NASA was able to procure the services of this fine and outstanding Oklahoman. Oklahoma probably has fewer men in high executive offices than most States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Certainly. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have made no charges against Mr. Breene Kerr. The gentleman is wrong in saying I did.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has talked about his background.

Mr. GROSS. What is wrong with talking about his background?

Mr. ALBERT. The implication of the gentleman's remarks, as I understood them—and I came in in the middle of the gentleman's 1-minute speech—was that there was something wrong about the appointment of Breene Kerr to the job in NASA. If I misunderstood the gentleman I certainly will retract my statement.

I will say to the gentleman that there is no young man within my knowledge, in Oklahoma or in the United States, who is better equipped to take a job of this kind than Breene Kerr.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON HAS NOT MISINFORMED THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was alleged on the floor just a short time ago that the United States had war plans for the invasion of North Vietnam. It was further indicated that these plans had been made known to the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. This must be clarified.

It should be understood by the Members of this House that it is the duty and responsibility of our military people to have contingency plans prepared to cope with any foreseeable emergency. The committees of the House, and the Members generally, I believe, are aware that this is a military necessity.

This is not to say that any particular plan is up to the minute with respect to any particular point on the globe, but basic plans are, and will continue to be made, for any and all trouble spots as they arise. To state that the United States plans

to move the war in Vietnam to the north implies that such contingency plans as may exist are, in fact, being implemented. The President has plainly indicated that this is not the fact.

To say that the President has deliberately misled the American people is, I believe, inexcusable and improper. It certainly does not show the national unity that is needed in coping with the trying problems of southeast Asia.

#### FARM INCOME NOW LOWEST IN 7 YEARS

(Mr. LATTA (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, according to a UPI release appearing in the Bowling Green (Ohio) Daily Sentinel-Tribune of May 29, 1964, farm income hit a 7-year low on May 15, 1964. I suggest that Members of the House and Senate and administration officials read this article. It follows:

##### FARM INCOME NOW LOWEST IN 7 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—Prices farmers received for crops and livestock fell two-fifths of 1 percent during the month ending May 15, the Agriculture Department reported Thursday.

This decline left farm prices 2 percent below a year ago, and the lowest at mid-May since 1957.

Cattle prices, which have become a major economic headache, declined again during the month and were at the lowest level since October 1957.

The Department's monthly farm price report also showed that the cost of production and living supplies purchased by farmers fell one-third of 1 percent from April's record high, primarily because of lower prices for feeder livestock and livestock feed. Farm costs were one-third of 1 percent above the level a year ago.

A comparison of farm commodity prices and farmers' costs that showed prices in the month ending May 15 averaged 75 percent of parity. This was unchanged from the mid-April figure, the lowest in many years, and compared with 77 percent in mid-May a year ago.

Parity is the price needed to put the value of products sold by farmers on a theoretically fair level in comparison with the cost of things they buy. The parity figures do not, however, measure such farm income supplements as direct Federal payments to farmers or the cashable marketing certificates which some wheat producers will get later this year.

The Department said lower prices for cattle, wholesale milk, and eggs were mainly responsible for the decrease in the index of prices received by farmers during the month. These declines were partially offset by higher prices for potatoes, apples, and hogs.

(Mr. TAFT (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. TAFT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

#### ADMINISTRATION POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for a few minutes from the floor attending a meeting of the House Republican policy committee. I have been advised by my friend and colleague from Florida [Mr. SIKES] that he made certain remarks on the floor in connection with certain testimony before the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. First I would like to state—and I made this very clear in my remarks earlier—that the contingency plans to which I referred were based on information given to me by the State Department, and the State Department set forth that its policy was that it would take whatever steps may be necessary to protect southeast Asia from the Communist takeover. The policy position of the State Department went beyond this and stated that contingency plans were being prepared. This was an unclassified document, completely unclassified, and to say that I misused any information which was given to the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations is not in accordance with the facts, because this was unclassified material supplied by the Department of State and was not information supplied to the Defense Committee by Secretary McNamara or any other individual. Now, the gentleman from Florida referred to certain invasion war plans. I have never referred to any invasion war plans for North Vietnam. My statement as carried by the Associated Press in answer to a question is absolutely correct when I said, and I used the word, that plans were being prepared for all contingencies in this particular area. I think it is only fair to state that a play on words has been used here in answer to a question directed to the President of the United States. I would hope that we would not give the world, our allies, our friends, and, yes, our potential enemies, any idea that the national strategy of this country is not to have contingency plans so that we can defeat communism in the various areas of the world. My particular statement of Sunday was in support of the administration's preparations. It was not in opposition to those preparations. I am glad to support the administration in this regard.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I am very glad indeed to hear my distinguished colleague, for whom I have the highest regard and with whom I have worked very closely for many years on defense matters, say that this is in essence a play on words. I am sure that that is about the size of it. I think it most unfortunate that certain inferences appear to have been read into his statements. I quote from a statement that just came over the ticker:

WASHINGTON.—Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, today charged that President Johnson "deliberately misled the American people in stating that there were no plans to take the war in Vietnam to the Communist north."

That is the sort of thing that does create the sense of schism in our country and indicates a lack of

are trying to do to solve that unhappy situation in Vietnam. I do not think that my good friend would want the record to stand that the President of the United States has deliberately misled the American people, and of course he has not.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on that remark. I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] was on the floor of the House when I made it absolutely clear that there had been no decision reached by the administration, at any level, to implement any contingency plans as far as North Vietnam was concerned. I made this very clear in every statement that I have made. This is in essence the material relayed to me. I think Members on both sides of the aisle have to show some confidence in these position statements disseminated by the State Department of our country. President Johnson, I repeat, made the statement, as quoted in a UPI story that "I know of no plans being made to that effect."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has expired.

#### U.S. PLANS IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there still seems to be a point of difference between my understanding of what has been said and what has been quoted by the press from my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. It is not clear, from what the distinguished gentleman has said, just what he meant. He indicated there had been a play on words, and I believe he said an unfortunate play on words. But the gentleman has not stated that he did or did not say that President Johnson deliberately misled the American people in stating that there are no plans to take the war into North Vietnam.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SIKES. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clear this up once and for all. I repeat that it is not a correct statement for the President of the United States to say, in response to my statement which was quoted to him, what he did say in his press conference, that, "I know of no plans being made to that effect."

Mr. SIKES. That is a far cry from saying that the President deliberately misled the American people. This is the statement we are discussing.

Mr. LAIRD. I believe there are plans being developed in this area. I think the gentleman from Florida knows full well that there are. The point is that there has been no decision as to whether to implement those plans or not. But the gentleman knows full well that plans have been made.

Mr. SIKES. I said in my own statement, which the gentleman has in his hand—I made it available to him—ex-

My point is, Does the gentleman really feel that the President deliberately misled the American people? I do not think he does.

Mr. LAIRD. Certainly any casual reading of the President's statement would lead one to believe that he thought I was wrong in the statement that I made on Sunday. I am glad the gentleman from Florida in his own statement agrees precisely with what I said on Sunday in a radio interview.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I was on the floor when the gentleman from Wisconsin made his remarks. I was also shocked to hear them made in the context in which they were made. As I understand it, he made a statement over the weekend, which I read in the press, that he was a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles defense matters; and he stated in some radio interview, for what purpose I do not know, that we had plans to go into North Vietnam.

First of all, I do not know about the propriety of telling where we have plans; but I will not get into that. But I do think it is somewhat of an expansion of the gentleman's prerogative to say that the President has misled the American people. I think that he was trying to assure the American people—it may be out of context somewhat the way it was interpreted by the press—that we, at this moment, do not have any positive plans to take the war into North Vietnam. That is what I understood was said.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, and then I shall yield further to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say that I think it most unfortunate that this discussion has taken the turn that it has. I am afraid that some of the statements made here today will tend to mislead the American people.

As I understand it, the President said that we have no plans for the invasion of North Vietnam. Well, taken in proper context, I would agree that this is undoubtedly correct. I certainly do not think that the President has misled the American public. Everyone who has any knowledge at all of our Military Establishment knows that our military people have not dozens of plans, not hundreds of plans, but really thousands of plans that relate to possible contingencies in all areas of the world. These are contingencies and papers that relate to many very different matters. Our military people would be very derelict if they had not made all possible types of studies and tentative conclusions in regard to trouble spots throughout the world and spots that are not now trouble spots. But the American people are not, I think, fully conversant with details of this sort. To say that we have plans to invade a country, whether it be North Vietnam

or any other country, could very well be misleading, and in this context I believe it has been misleading. It is not correct to say that we are planning to invade North Vietnam.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. First I want to make it extremely clear that I have no quarrel with the press in any way as far as my being misquoted, because the Associated Press and the United Press went out of their way to even carry the words "prepared" and "preparation for contingencies" in italics. So, I do not think there can be any quarrel with me as far as the planning is concerned. I believed the Secretary of State when he stated that preparations would be made for these particular contingencies. In my interview I made it extremely clear that no decision had been made as to whether these plans and preparations would be implemented. But it does not seem to me that when my statement is quoted in a news conference and the answer is, "I know of no plans being made to that effect," that that is being completely forthright in giving the American people full information.

It would seem to me that "no comment" would have been much wiser.

#### THE NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION AND THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

Mr. SIKES. Now, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, called upon annually to review and pass upon the appropriation for the Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, I have been disturbed by statements which would indicate that the National Rifle Association, a great patriotic organization, and the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, an agency of the U.S. Government, have been used by certain organizations of questionable intent and motives for the procurement of weapons and ammunition. This is not in any sense correct. There is nothing to indicate a connection. These agencies have carried on for years a very fine program which makes available to responsible groups and organizations throughout the country—which must be bonded—weapons and ammunition for carrying on rifle practice. This is something which we in the United States have always considered extremely important for the proper training of our youth and the carrying on of our military defenses.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have read news stories of various sorts of small arms ordnance allegedly purchased as scrap, later reconditioned and circulated in illicit arms channels. We have Federal laws rigorously controlling traffic in automatic weapons. If such items are being improperly scrapped and made available to unscrupulous individuals,

the matter should certainly be investigated and appropriate action taken by competent authorities.

I am aware also of the sale of certain surplus small arms and ammunition to civilians by the Department of the Army, under the provisions of the National Defense Act, as amended, as a means of encouraging marksmanship among those persons who would be called upon for military service in the event of war. This is a desirable thing and important to our future security.

However, to imply or suggest that the highly worthwhile program of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice has been subverted to the ends of extremist organizations is both unfair and improper, since no evidence has been produced to indicate that this is the case. It is equally unfair to suggest that a patriotic, public service organization, such as the National Rifle Association of America, of which I am proud to be a member, has in some manner been hoodwinked into allying itself with various vague extremist organizations, again with complete lack of evidence that this is true.

The National Rifle Association consists of 850,000 individual members and 11,000 affiliated shooting organizations of which approximately half are junior rifle clubs. Under Federal law, when these clubs have been accepted for affiliation by the National Rifle Association, through a screening process which is quite thorough, they are entitled to receive certain assistance from the Government in support of their rifle marksmanship programs. All rifles issued on loan through the national board program are on memorandum receipt, and, before they can be delivered, the club must be fully bonded to the extent of the value of the rifles. They remain at all times the property of the U.S. Government and must be returned or accounted for. Free ammunition is issued for the purpose of permitting the club to fire marksmanship qualification courses prescribed by the Army. This qualification course must be fired and the results reported to the national board in order for the club to maintain its eligibility to receive free issues.

The program of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, by helping to keep alive the most important basic skill of the soldier, the ability to use his own personal weapon, is performing a good and an important service to the country. I support it fully.

I understand the organization which calls itself the Minutemen is under Justice Department surveillance. The Paul Revere Associated Yeomen, Inc., has been the subject of independent investigation, and I understand the evidence indicates that it consists of the expressions of one individual possessed of sufficient private means to permit him to print and distribute his own particular philosophy.

There simply is no connection between these organizations and the patriotic, highly respected National Rifle Association and the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and it is most unfortunate that any association is in-

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman from Florida has made crystal clear the position of the National Rifle Association in this situation and the charge that has been made against them.

Over the years I have seen the operations of the National Rifle Association. They do a magnificent job. They do a great job with the youth of the country in the handling and use of firearms. Their contribution to the national defense has been outstanding. The encouragement they have given to the people of this Nation has been a real contribution.

I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for bringing this to the attention of the Members of Congress.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. He knows full well of the important work done by these two great organizations, and I am very appreciative of his comments.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. FEIGHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### NEEDED: A STANDBY U.N. FORCE

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. Fuqua) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Richard N. Gardner's view of a standby United Nations force is that of the realist, not of a pie-in-the-sky idealist. In the following article which appeared several weeks ago in the New York Times magazine he admits that the standby force he envisions would for the moment be very modest. His plan would provide for the earmarking of national units for U.N. use, a flexible callup system, and advance training for U.N. service. This is not so very far from the present system of requesting members to furnish troops for specific peacekeeping operations, but it is just far enough to be a step in the right direction. He maintains that the creation of a standing U.N. force is neither practical nor necessary at this time.

Mr. Gardner brings to bear on his subject the legal insight of a lawyer and former professor of law at Harvard and Columbia. The case for strengthening the United Nations peacekeeping capacity, he writes, rests on the fact that in our unstable nuclear age nations will never be willing to lay down their weapons until international law machinery to protect their interests has been created. The standby U.N. force Mr. Gardner suggests would represent one more essential addition to the international law enforcement machinery which is a pre-requisite of a world envisioned